

Counting Statistics of Parallel Aluminum-atom Wires

Ying-Tsan Tang and Yu-Chang Chen

Department of Electrophysics, National Chiao Tung University, 1001 Ta Hsueh Road, Hsinchu 30010, Taiwan

Abstract

We have studied how the lateral interaction affects the electric conductance, the second-order current correlation (shot noise), and the third-order one (skewness) of a pair of parallel Al atomic wires. The field operator of wave function is introduced to calculate the current-current correlations. The corresponding wave functions are self-consistently obtained by iteration according to the Lippmann-Schwinger first-principles calculation. The results show that when the distance between two wires is sufficiently small, the bonding interaction near the Fermi level will induce a spatial delocalization of electrons. This leads to an electric conduction value greater than the sum of two uncorrelated atomic wire, and a side-band peak is generated around the maximum conductance. This correlation can also be observed from the shot noise and the skewness. In addition, we find that the three-order Fano factor is negatively related to the conductance.

Key words: Counting Statistics, Aluminum-atom wire, quantum transport

Introduction

Molecular transistors have become an interesting and popular research topic due to recent advances in nanotechnology[1]. From macroscopic aspect, the electric conductance of conductors with the same structure is linearly proportional to the amounts of charge carriers. However, such relationship no longer sustain because the interference between atomic bonding and orbitals is very important when devices are scaled down to the size of molecules. Lately, the studies on electric conductance of molecular wires and monolayers have been performed by mechanically controllable break junctions[2][3][4] and self-assembly on a solid surface[5][6]. Nonetheless, few have focused on the correlation of distance between the atomic/molecular chains. As a consequence,

this paper aims to investigate the interactions between wires and the current correlations of various moments.

According to Levitov-Lesovik transport formula[7], all moments of carrier disturbance in the long time limit may be expanded by transmission probability T_n (with n the channel index), such as $S_1 \propto \sum_n T_n$ and $S_2 \propto \sum_n T_n (1 - T_n)$. The former gives the average current and the later defines the fluctuation of current (shot noise) at zero temperature. Recently, the third moment S_3 , i.e., the asymmetry of the distribution function of current fluctuation, is of particular interest, and has also been experimentally probed by many groups.[8][9] Basically, the disturbance originates from the discontinuity of electron itself. In Schottky's vacuum tube experiment, $S_p = 2e \langle I \rangle$, and $F_2 = S_2/S_p = 1$, which presents no correlation existing between electrons. Since carriers cross the junction randomly and independently, this electron transfer can be described by the Poisson statistics. In nanostructures and mesoscopic devices, however, there will be correlation between electrons in the transport process due to the electronic structure, electromagnetic forces, the Pauli exclusion principle, and the Coulomb interactions[10]. As a consequence, its Fano factor may be greater (super-Poisson) or less (sub-Poisson) than unity. The shot noise can serve as a convenient tool for the probing of electronic structure and of the charge amount of a unit carrier, helping understand the nature of transport. Until now, most studies adopt model-based parameters to simulate the transport process. Nevertheless, first-principles calculation offers a possibility to accurately link electronic structure to all moments of the current correlations, which is superior to the model calculations. For instance, Chen and Di Ventra[11] found that the shot noise of Si atomic wires of different lengths oscillates as a function of atom number in the wire. Bin Wang and Jian Wang[6] performed first-principles calculations based on the non-equilibrium Green's function to obtain the shot noise properties and found that current increases almost linearly with the bias voltage for all Pt atomic structures. All these calculated Fano factors well coincide with the recent experimental data.

In the transport process, charge carriers enter the nanojunction from a lead. Accordingly, it can either arrive at the second lead or reflect back. As a prototypical example, in this paper this junction is made of a pair of atomic aluminum wires that are sandwiched by two planar jellium electrodes. The main reason for choosing Al atoms is because its electronic configuration ($3S^23P^1$) is simpler than Au atoms so that it is more convenient to observe orbital bonding and interference of channels (three valence electrons: sp_z , p_x and p_y [14]). Besides, studies on aluminum nanojunction have also been extensively applied to experiments[13][15]. In the experiment by Van den Borm and van Ruitenbeek[16], the Fano factor of Al contacts was around 0.3~0.6, which proves that the electrons within the junction travel in order, instead of random motion as in classical physics.

In general, transport problems deal with non-equilibrium states, and the counting statistics of current is often related to the bias voltage between terminals. Therefore, these issues cannot be tackled directly by the equilibrium ground-state of non-interaction electrodes. To overcome this difficulty, we adopt the density functional theory (DFT) coupled the Lippmann-Schwinger equation (LS-DFT) and perform self-consistent calculation for the ground-state wave function of systems with nanojunctions at limited bias voltages. This approach is essentially equivalent to the DFT combined with the non-equilibrium Green's function[17](NEGF-DFT). One different is that the wave function used in LS-DFT consists of the leads and the junction, while the one for NEGF-DFT is restricted in the junction and a self-energy has to be considered in the Green's function[18]. When calculating the shot noise and skewness through the field operator of wave function, we are faced with the products of field operators and the Bloch-de-Dominicis theory is applied to recast these multiple operators into pairs. The results resemble the previous study on multi-current correlation functions by the scattering theory.[19]

In mesoscopic systems, the size of junction is typically greater than the dephasing length of electrons. The wave functions of electrons will lose coherence after multiple scattering. The interference of transverse quantum channels is neglectably small. However, for the junction of atomic size, the transport of electrons can be coherent. Hence the overlap integral of wave function at different transverse momenta $\mathbf{K}$ must be kept in describing the current correlation of different moment based on wave functions. In other words, the effects of multi-channel mixing is included in our calculations. Until now, the analysis of current correlations of atom-sized parallel Al chains by first-principles hasn't been proposed. To complete this goal, we have developed a current operator composed of DFT self-consistent wave functions. Even though the current of higher moments is hard to measure and calculate, it can be demonstrated to provide a way to obtain the detailed interference effect caused by wave functions at atomic scale. In the following, we expand the current correlation of different moments in the basis of wave functions. The space parameters of the two metal contacts connecting parallel Al wires are 5.8 a.u. between Al atoms, the Al radius is $r_s = 2$ a.u, and the last Al atom is placed 2 a.u. outside the boundary of jellium model positive background.

1 Theoretical Model and Calculation Method

The Hamiltonian for the whole system is $H = H_0 + V(\mathbf{r})$, where $H_0 = \sum_{E, \mathbf{K}_{\parallel}, \alpha} E_{\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}} a_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{\alpha+} a_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{\alpha}$ stands for the bare electrodes described by the jellium model and $V(\mathbf{r})$ is the scattering potential of the central nanostructure. The system's ground-state wave function can be obtained through self-consistent

calculation with the Lippman-Schwinger equation, which is.

$$\Psi_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{L(R)}(\mathbf{r}) = \Psi_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{0,L(R)}(\mathbf{r}) + \int d^3\mathbf{r}_1 \int d^3\mathbf{r}_2 G_E^0(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_1) V(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \Psi_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{L(R)}(\mathbf{r}_2) \quad (1)$$

Here, $\Psi_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{0,L(R)}(\mathbf{r})$ represents the unperturbed wave function of the electrodes before scattering the nanostructured object, and it can be expressed $\Psi_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{0,L(R)}(\mathbf{r}) = (2\pi)^{-1} e^{i\mathbf{K}_{\parallel} \cdot \mathbf{R}} \cdot u_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{L(R)}(z)$, where $u_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{L(R)}(z)$ is the wave propagating along the z-direction. When $z \rightarrow \pm\infty$, the boundary conditions satisfied by wave functions on the left and the right sides are

$$u_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^L(z) = \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi\hbar^2 k_L}} \times \begin{cases} e^{ik_L z} + R_L e^{-ik_L z}, z < -\infty \\ T_L e^{ik_L z}, z > \infty \end{cases}, \quad (2)$$

$$u_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^R(z) = \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi\hbar^2 k_L}} \times \begin{cases} e^{-ik_L z} + R_R e^{ik_L z}, z > \infty \\ T_R e^{-ik_L z}, z < -\infty \end{cases}. \quad (3)$$

The subscript $\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}$ is the momentum of electron with its direction parallel to the surface of electrodes, while $e^{ik_{\alpha} z}$ is the free propagating wave perpendicular to it. The electron's momentum is given by $k_{\alpha} = \sqrt{2m(E - \mathbf{K}_{\parallel}^2/2m) - v_{eff}(\pm\infty)}$, $v_{eff}(z)$ denotes the energy of the bottom conduction band in electrodes. It should be noted that G_E^0 is the Green's function without the addition of the nanostructured object. The scattering potential is given by

$$V(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = V_{ps}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) + \left\{ (V_{xc}[\rho(\mathbf{r}_1)] - V_{xc}[\rho_0(\mathbf{r}_1)]) + \int d^3\mathbf{r}_3 \frac{\delta\rho(\mathbf{r}_3)}{|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3|} \right\} \delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2). \quad (4)$$

$V_{ps}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)$ is a non-local pseudo-potential formed by covalent electrons with the core electron being transferred. V_{xc} is the exchange-correlation potential derived by LDA, and the final potential is the Hatree potential. $\rho_0(\mathbf{r})$ and $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ represent the charge density for the electrodes and the whole system, respectively. $\delta\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is their difference. In numerical calculation, the box includes the middle molecular system and partial electrodes. It is chosen sufficiently large so that outer electrodes are not affected by molecules. Within the box, 2880 plane waves are utilized to calculate this coherent quantum system.

1.1 First-principles current calculation

At first we define a field operator, $\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \sum_{E, \mathbf{K}_{\parallel}, \alpha} a_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{\alpha}(t) \Psi_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{r})$, to describe the many-body state of the system. $a_{E\mathbf{K}_{\parallel}}^{\alpha(+)}$ is an operator meaning the annihilation/creation of electron at time t and at electrode α , and it satisfies the anti-commutation relations, $\{a_{E\mathbf{K}_1}^{\alpha}, a_{E\mathbf{K}_2}^{\beta+}\} = \delta_{\alpha\beta} \delta(E_1 - E_2) \delta(\mathbf{K}_1 - \mathbf{K}_2) f_E^{\alpha}$. $f_E^{\alpha} = 1 / \{1 + \exp[(E - \mu_{L(R)}) / k_B T]\}$ is the probability of occupying the α electrode, which satisfies the Fermi-Dirac distribution. Based on the definition of electric current, we derive that

$$\hat{I}(z, t) = \frac{e\hbar}{mi} \int d\mathbf{r}_{\perp} \int dE_1 \int dE_2 \int d\mathbf{K}_1 \int d\mathbf{K}_2 e^{i(E_1 - E_2)t/\hbar} a_{E_1\mathbf{K}_1}^{\alpha+} a_{E_2\mathbf{K}_2}^{\beta} \tilde{I}_{E_1\mathbf{K}_1, E_2\mathbf{K}_2}^{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{I}_{E_1\mathbf{K}_1, E_2\mathbf{K}_2}^{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}) = (\Psi_{E_1\mathbf{K}_1}^{\alpha})^* \nabla \Psi_{E_2\mathbf{K}_2}^{\beta} - \nabla (\Psi_{E_1\mathbf{K}_1}^{\alpha})^* \Psi_{E_2\mathbf{K}_2}^{\beta}$. At zero temperature, the average current is given by

$$\langle \hat{I}(z) \rangle = \frac{e\hbar}{mi} \int dE \int d\mathbf{r}_{\perp} \int d\mathbf{K} \tilde{I}_{E\mathbf{K}, E\mathbf{K}}^{RR}(\mathbf{r}_{\perp}), \quad (6)$$

and it is noticed that at steady state, $\langle \hat{I}(z) \rangle$ is independent of z .

1.2 Second moment of the current

We can extend the derivation and obtain the second and the third moment of current. The power spectrum of shot noise has the form

$$S_2(\omega, T, z_1, z_2) = 2\pi\hbar \int d(t_1 - t_2) e^{i\omega(t_1 - t_2)} \langle \delta \hat{I}(z_1, t_1) \delta \hat{I}(z_2, t_2) \rangle, \quad (7)$$

with $\delta \hat{I}(t) \equiv \hat{I}(t) - \langle \hat{I} \rangle$. When calculating the shot noise, we have to deal with the quantum statistical expectation value of the products $\langle a_{E_1}^{\alpha+} a_{E_2}^{\beta} a_{E_3}^{\gamma+} a_{E_4}^{\delta} \rangle$. With the help of Wick-Bloch-de Dominicis theorem, it can be decomposed as $\langle a_{E_1\mathbf{K}_1}^{\alpha+} a_{E_2\mathbf{K}_2}^{\beta} a_{E_3\mathbf{K}_3}^{\gamma+} a_{E_4\mathbf{K}_4}^{\delta} \rangle = \langle a_{E_1\mathbf{K}_1}^{\alpha+} a_{E_2\mathbf{K}_2}^{\beta} \rangle \langle a_{E_3\mathbf{K}_3}^{\gamma+} a_{E_4\mathbf{K}_4}^{\delta} \rangle + \langle a_{E_1\mathbf{K}_1}^{\alpha+} a_{E_4\mathbf{K}_4}^{\delta} \rangle \langle a_{E_2\mathbf{K}_2}^{\beta} a_{E_3\mathbf{K}_3}^{\gamma+} \rangle$. Substituting this result into Eq. (7), we have

$$S_2(\omega, T; z_1, z_2) = 2\pi\hbar \left(\frac{e\hbar}{mi} \right)^2 \sum_{\alpha\beta=L,R} \int dE f_{E+\hbar\omega}^{\alpha} (1 - f_E^{\beta}) \int d\mathbf{r}_{1\perp} \int d\mathbf{r}_2 \int d\mathbf{K}_1 \int d\mathbf{K}_2 \tilde{I}_{E+\hbar\omega\mathbf{K}_1, E\mathbf{K}_2}^{RL}(\mathbf{r}_1) \tilde{I}_{E\mathbf{K}_1, E+\hbar\omega\mathbf{K}_2}^{LL}(\mathbf{r}_2).$$

Because shot noise reflects the current correlation at zero temperature, the steady-state ($\omega \rightarrow 0$) shot noise is thus found as

$$S_2(z_1, z_2) = 2\pi\hbar \left(\frac{e\hbar}{mi}\right)^2 \sum_{\alpha, \beta=L,R} \int_{E_{FL}}^{E_{FR}} \int d\mathbf{r}_{1\perp} \int d\mathbf{r}_{2\perp} \int d\mathbf{K}_1 \int d\mathbf{K}_2 \tilde{I}_{E+\hbar\omega\mathbf{K}_1, E\mathbf{K}_2}^{RL}(\mathbf{r}_1) \tilde{I}_{E\mathbf{K}_1, E+\hbar\omega\mathbf{K}_2}^{LR}(\mathbf{r}_2) \quad (9)$$

1.3 Third moment of the current

With similar approach, the third moment of the current is defined as

$$S_3(\omega, \omega', z_1, z_2, z_3) = 2\pi\hbar \left(\frac{e\hbar}{mi}\right)^2 \int d(t_1 - t_3) \int d(t_2 - t_3) \times e^{i\omega(t_1 - t_2)} e^{i\omega'(t_2 - t_3)} \langle \delta\hat{I}(z_1, t_1) \delta\hat{I}(z_2, t_2) \delta\hat{I}(z_3, t_3) \rangle \quad (10)$$

Substituting current difference $\delta\hat{I}$ into Eq. (10) and considering the steady-state current ($\omega = \omega' = 0$) at zero temperature ($T = 0$), we have

$$S_3(z_1, z_2, z_3) = (2\pi\hbar)^2 \left(\frac{e\hbar}{mi}\right)^3 \int_{E_{FL}}^{E_{FR}} dE \int d\mathbf{r}_{1\perp} \int d\mathbf{r}_{2\perp} \int d\mathbf{r}_{3\perp} \int d\mathbf{K}_1 \int d\mathbf{K}_2 \int d\mathbf{K}_3 \times \left[\tilde{I}_{E\mathbf{K}_1, E\mathbf{K}_2}^{RL}(\mathbf{r}_1) \tilde{I}_{E\mathbf{K}_2, E\mathbf{K}_3}^{LL}(\mathbf{r}_2) \tilde{I}_{E\mathbf{K}_3, E\mathbf{K}_1}^{LR}(\mathbf{r}_3) - \tilde{I}_{E\mathbf{K}_1, E\mathbf{K}_2}^{RL}(\mathbf{r}_1) \tilde{I}_{E\mathbf{K}_1, E\mathbf{K}_2, E\mathbf{K}_3}^{RR}(\mathbf{r}_2) \tilde{I}_{E\mathbf{K}_3, E\mathbf{K}_1}^{LR}(\mathbf{r}_3) \right]$$

Note that the current density in S_2 and S_3 keeps interference between wave functions with different transverse momenta $\mathbf{K}$, which does not coincide with Eq. (6).

2 Results and Discussion

To analyze the conductance, the second-moment shot noise, and the third-moment skewness, we have derived formulas for different moments of the current correlation through the first-principles DFT combined with field operator of wave function. That is, Eq.(6), Eq.(9), and Eq.(11). The Lippmann-Schwinger equation is utilized to self-consistently calculate the scattering wave

Fig. 1. The differential conductance of two parallel four-atom wires as a function of wire separation. The dashed line stands for the sum of conductance of the two isolating atom chains.

function of the whole system. Figure 1 shows the conductance in the unit of $G_0 [= e^2/h]$ versus the distance between two parallel wires.

We find that the differential conductance has a maximum value of $3.68 G_0$ at the distance of 5 a.u. and a side peak at the distance of 5.5 a.u. As the distance is increased, the conductance still presents oscillating changes (after 8 a.u.). At last, the conventional conductance is calculated when the distance between two wires is effectively infinite, i.e., two times the conductance of a single wire. In order to investigate the modification on the conductance by the interactions between wires, we study the distribution of carrier density at $d = 4.5 \sim 7.5$ a.u.

From Fig. 2, it can be seen that the σ -bonding state is formed through the interactions between the S and the P_z orbitals in the atomic wire comprising Al atoms ($3S^23P^1$), which decides the distribution of charge carrier between wires. While the distribution along Al wires is determined by the Π -like interaction between the P_x and the P_y orbitals. A comparison of carrier density distribution shows that the minimum density of 0.23 occurs at $d=5.0$ a.u. and that the minimum of 0.16 also takes place along the wire. It indicates that the delocalization of carriers reaches its maximum at this distance. The delocalized electrons do not belong to any bonds or atoms, and few electrons accumulate in this region. Finally, large amounts of electrons rapidly travel through the system and arrive at the other electrode, causing the maximum current. We observe the distribution of DOS for further understanding the relationship between delocalization and distance as in Fig. 3. Note that a small

Fig. 2. The spatial distribution of carrier density

bias voltage is exerted, , and the Fermi energy in the left electrode is set to be zero.

Figure 3 shows the $\text{DOS}(E_F)$ of parallel atomic chains at varied distances. To observe its local density of states in the atomic wires, the projected DOS is utilized. Take the case of $d=4.5$ a.u. for example, we understand that the first two peaks (located between $E = -0.15 \sim -4.5$) are mainly contributed by the S and P_z orbitals. Nevertheless, the orbital of P_{xy} influences the region near the Fermi energy. When increasing the distance, the bump between the first two peaks disappears gradually and eventually become one single peak. It is noticed that the peak shape of P_{xy} orbital is modified and the extent has positive relationship with the change in the DOS with the distance (top-left inset of Fig. 3), but the peak position is not shifted. It means that the change in carrier density caused by the distance for σ -type interaction is far greater than that for Π -type interaction.

Normally, the measured conductance corresponds to the change of the electronic structure at the Fermi energy. In this case, it reflects the exact change of P_{xy} orbital. Comparing the top-left inset of Fig. 3 to Fig. 1, we find that the $\text{DOS}(E_F)$ cannot completely decide the tendency of conductance. For example, the $\text{DOS}(E_F)$ exhibits a parabolic curve at 5.5 to 7 a.u., forms a plateau at 7 to 7.5 a.u., and then declines linearly. Such results disagree with those for conductance, which shows linear decrease only. This owes to the fact that electron transport is a dynamic process. In calculating conductance, we need to consider the transition rate of electrons in addition to the DOS. The transition rate versus the distance in the nanojunction is shown in the top-right inset of Fig. 3. It is observed that the electronic transition rate has its maximum at $d = 5.2$ a.u., shows a valley at 7.5 a.u., and climbs up afterwards.

Fig. 3. The distribution of DOS in the AL wire between two electrodes at $d=4.5, 5$, and 5.5 a.u. The top insets present the DOS of single wires, i.e., the distance is sufficiently large. The Fermi energy on the left side is zero, and the bias voltage is 0.01eV . The gray line denotes the transport regime. The top-left inset gives the DOS at the Fermi level as a function of wire distance. The dashed bar on the right shows the value for infinite distance. The top-right inset is the tunneling rate of electrons near the Fermi level.

So, when the DOS (E_F) is multiplied by the tunneling rate, a side-band peak exists near the maximum delocalization distance, resulting in a similar curve as conductance.

To realize the relationship between moments of counting statistics of current fluctuations in the Aluminum chains, we focus on how the second-order Fano factor (related to the shot noise) and the third-order Fano factor (related to the asymmetry of the distribution) change with the distance. In Fig. 4, F_2 first decreases and then increases, and two dips are respectively formed at $d = 5$ and 5.5 a.u., a contrary behavior with respect to the conductance (two peaks).

According to Ref. [21], the suppression of shot noise in metallic conductors arises from open quantum channels. Here we know that the channels are mainly from the Pxy orbital, especially at $d = 5$ and 5.5 a.u., and that the interaction between p orbitals further induces a spatial delocalization of electrons, leading to the sudden rise of current. The bottom inset of Fig. 4 plots the third moment versus the separation distance. It is found that F_3 is weakly negative at varied distances, indicating the distribution function of the number of electrons transferred through a conductor within a given time period is negatively skewed, and it is also strongly negatively correlated with the conductance. Different from the studies on single C4 or C5 chain, where F_3 and conductance are always positively correlated. In this case, we find that F_3 is

Fig. 4. The second- and third-order Fano factors versus the distance between two parallel Al chains. The right dashed line denotes the value at infinite distance and at bias voltage of 0.01eV.

positively correlated before $d = 7.5$ a.u. and reveals highly negative correlation at greater distances. It should be noticed that the least conductance occurs at $d = 8$ a.u. while the F_3 value is strongly skewed, implying it is difficult for charge carriers to pass through the junction.

Acknowledgements

This is the Acknowledgements section. This section is placed at the end of the article, just before the references.

References

- [1] N. Agrait, A. L. Yeyati, and J. M. van Ruitenbeek, Phys. Rep. **377**, 81 (2003)
- [2] H. Ohnishi, Y. Kondo, and K. Takayanagi, Nature **395**, 780 (1998).
- [3] A. I. Yanson, G. Rubio Bollinger, H. E. van den Brom, N. Agrait, J. M. van Ruitenbeek, Nature **395**, 783–785 (1998)
- [4] B. H. Hong, S. C. Bae, C. W. Lee, S. Jeong, and K. S. Kim, Science **294**, 348 (2001)

- [5] R. H. M. Smit, C. Untiedt, G. Rubio-Bollinger, R. C. Segers, and J. M. van Ruitenbeek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 076805 (2003)
- [6] J. T. Wang, C. F. Chen, E. Wang, and Y. Kawazoe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 116102 (2010)
- [7] L. S. Levitov and G. B. Lesovik, JETP Lett. **58**, 230 (1993)
- [8] S. Gustavsson, R. Leturcq, B. Simovic, R. Schleser, T. Ihn, P. Studerus, K. Ensslin, D. Studerus, D. C. Driscoll, and A. C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 076605 (2006)
- [9] Yu. Bomze, G. Gershon, D. Shovkun, L. S. Levitov, and M. Reznikov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 176601 (2005)
- [10] M. J. M. de Jong and C.W.J. Beenakker in "Mesoscopic Electron Transport," edited by L.L. Sohn, L.P. Kouwenhoven, and G. Schoen, NATO ASI Series Vol. 345 (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1997), pp. 225-258.
- [11] Y.-C. Chen and M. Di Ventra, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 153304 (2003)
- [12] Bin Wang and Jian Wang, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 165401 (2011)
- [13] I. K. Yanson, O. I. Shklyarevskii, J. M. van Ruitenbeek, and S. Speller, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 033411 (2008)
- [14] E. Scheer, P. Joyez, D. Esteve, C. Urbina, and M. H. Devoret, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3535 (1997).
- [15] M. Zgirski, K.-P. Riikonen, V. Touboltsev, and K. Yu. Arutyunov, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 054508 (2008)
- [16] H. E. van den Brom and J. M. van Ruitenbeek, in Statistical and Dynamical Aspects of Mesoscopic Systems, edited by D. Reguera, G. Platero, L. L. Bonilla, and J. M. Rubí, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000 ,p.114.
- [17] J. Taylor, H. Guo, and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 245407 (2001)
- [18] J. Wang and H. Guo, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 045119 (2009)
- [19] J. Salo, F. W. J. Hekking and J. P. Pekola, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 125427 (2006)
- [20] J. Yao, Y.-C. Chen, M. Di Ventra, and Z. Q. Yang, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 233407 (2006)
- [21] C. W. J. Beenakker and M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 1889–1892 (1992)







